

#### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The allowance of Claims 12 and 13 and the indicated allowability of the subject matter of Claims 18-20 are noted with appreciation. Rejected Claims 1-11 have been cancelled to expedite the allowance of this application.

Claim 14 has been made dependent upon Claim 12 and is thus clearly allowable.

The rejection of Claims 15-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casey in view of Ida and further in view of Bailey is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 recites a combination of a mat fastener and a floor mat. There is no suggestion whatsoever in the prior art of the proposed modification of the grommet of Casey in view of the teachings of Ida and Bailey. The construction of the grommet of Casey is not appropriate for use with the floor mat of Bailey. Casey's grommet is intended to be inserted through a wall 11 or a like partitioning structure, and it has no means that could securely grip a floor mat.

It is apparent that the flanges of the male and female members of the Casey grommet are intended to contact hard surfaces. As described in column 4, lines 26-41, upon installation of the grommet 59 through a wall, annular indentations in the flanges cause the flanges to flex more

against the wall as the female and male members of the grommet pull toward one another. This could not occur if the grommet were used with the floor mat of Bailey. Moreover, as disclosed, the flexing may be so great that the bottom surfaces 74 and 94 contact a wall. In this case, portions of the wall would not be received in annular indentations, because the annular indentations will have been flattened to such an extent that there would no longer be any annular indentations.

The final paragraph of Claim 15 recites that a portion of the mat is received in the concavity of the female grommet. The rejection does not address this specific feature of Applicant's invention, and this is not a new issue.

Dependent Claim 17, which previously recited that the mat is sandwiched between the concavities of the grommets, has been amended, for consistency with base Claim 15, to recite that a portion of the mat is also received in the concavity of the male grommet.

The above-mentioned features recited in Claims 15 and 17 are clearly shown in Figs. 9-11 of Applicant's drawings. By virtue of these features, the mat is securely gripped between the grommets. Nothing of the sort is taught or suggested by the references relied upon in the rejection.

The proposal in the rejection to modify the grommet of Casey to include protrusions and prongs taught by Ida is clearly inappropriate, because it would destroy the intended operation of the Casey grommet by interfering with the engagement of the flange surfaces with the wall, as intended by Casey.

Accordingly, independent Claim 15 and dependent Claims 16-21 should be allowed.

This application is now believed to be clearly in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been requested separately, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NHS:lmb

Miles & Stockbridge P.C.  
1751 Pinnacle Drive  
Suite 500  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 903-9000  
February 2, 2004

By: Nelson H. Shapiro  
Nelson H. Shapiro  
Reg. No. 17,095